

This pandemic has magnified our need to be self-reliant and have the ability to repair our own devices, especially when large retailers are forced to shutter.

My bill will guarantee consumers and small businesses that right by requiring manufacturers to make diagnostic repair information, parts, and tools readily available rather than forcing individuals to go to an original equipment manufacturer.

This commonsense legislation will help make technology repairs more accessible and affordable for items from cell phones to laptops to farm equipment.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues to bring this legislation to the floor and finally give individuals the autonomy they deserve.

**PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3684, INVESTING IN A NEW VISION FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION IN AMERICA ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 508 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 508**

*Resolved*, That during further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3684) to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to section 6 of House Resolution 504—

(a) after debate, each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to subsection (b) shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and

(b) it shall be in order at any time after debate for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of, and such amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. All points of order against the further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in subsection (b) of the first section of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider con-

current resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622) shall not apply during the remainder of the One Hundred Seventeenth Congress to a joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.

SEC. 5. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 403, agreed to May 18, 2021), is amended by striking “July 1, 2021” each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) “July 30, 2021”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule, House Resolution 508, to provide for further consideration of H.R. 3684, the INVEST in America Act under a structured rule.

The rule makes in order 149 amendments and provides en bloc authority to the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The rule also allows for consideration of concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, and provides that the provisions of section 202 of the National Emergencies Act shall not apply for the remainder of the 117th Congress to a joint resolution terminating the national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.

Lastly, the rule provides for recess instructions, suspension authority, and same-day authority through July 30, 2021.

Madam Speaker, our roads and bridges are crumbling before our eyes, and our public transportation systems are suffering drastically from reduced ridership during the pandemic. With these challenges comes a great opportunity. Our country can use this unique once-in-a-generation opportunity to reimagine and rebuild our community in America's transportation systems and build back better.

As a former member of the California Air Resources Board and a former chair of both the State Assembly Transportation Committee and the State Senate Transportation Committee and a former member of the Bay Area's MPO, I have spent my career focused on the transportation sector and reducing

greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants to help fight against climate change.

□ 1245

In my 30 years of public service, never has the time been more ripe to seize this opportunity to reimagine and reinvest in America's transportation infrastructure.

The INVEST in America Act offers a new approach to Federal transportation policy by emphasizing fixing our existing roads and bridges first and making record investments in passenger rail, public transit, cycling and walking infrastructure, and zero-emission options while creating safer, more connected communities for all Americans. This bill would also help create millions of jobs that cannot be exported.

Thanks to strong Buy American provisions and labor protections, including Davis-Bacon, the work will be fueled by American workers, manufacturing, and ingenuity, with targeted investments in rural and underserved communities.

Madam Speaker, our country badly needs the investments outlined in this bill. Over 40 percent of America's roads are in poor or mediocre condition, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers. In fact, our roads have a D rating, and American motorists are forced to pay over \$1,000 every year in wasted time and fuel as a result of our failure to act.

In my own State, California's infrastructure does not fare any better. We have a C-minus rating overall, with a D rating for roads and a C-minus for bridges and transit, in spite of California voters voting over and over again to tax themselves to invest in our infrastructure.

Not only is the problem of crumbling infrastructure a detriment to our economy, but it is dangerous to public safety. Over 36,000 Americans die on our Nation's roadways every year. The INVEST in America Act directs \$343 billion to roads, bridges, and safety programs, with record levels of investment in walking and cycling infrastructure, complete streets planning and smarter road design, and safe routes to schools.

This transformative bill also directs Federal investments in transit and rail and reimagines our national transportation policies. Public transit is essential to everyday living in communities across the country, providing access to jobs, schools, healthcare, and childcare.

Currently, there is a \$176 billion transit backlog, and transit ridership, of course, is declining because of COVID-19. These issues, if not addressed, stand to further increase congestion, hamper the economy, worsen air quality, and disproportionately affect underserved communities.

The INVEST in America Act provides \$109 billion for transit to create a safe and reliable transit system that ensures every American, including those

in economically disadvantaged and underserved neighborhoods, can get to essential services, as I have said, like jobs, healthcare, and childcare.

Importantly, this effort takes every opportunity to meet the challenges of the climate crisis. Climate change is the defining challenge of our time, and transportation is the number one source of greenhouse gas emissions. The INVEST in America Act takes bold steps to build the clean infrastructure and transportation sector of the future by reforming existing programs and launching new initiatives to reduce carbon pollution.

For example, it invests \$8.3 billion in highway, transit, and rail projects that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and it holds States accountable for their performance by measuring annual progress.

Moreover, under the Clean Corridors program, a program that I was proud to author, it invests \$4 billion in electric vehicle charging and alternative fueling stations. This infrastructure along designated corridors will help reduce range anxiety and help America shift to the next generation of clean vehicles.

To further address climate change and equity, this bill increases funding and incentives for transit-oriented development, ensuring that more Americans have access to walkable and transit-supportive communities, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions and, most importantly, improving their quality of life and their ability to be at home with their family.

Finally, this bill invests in safe drinking water infrastructure by replacing dangerous lead piping and treating PFAS in our water supply. It will also help ensure that all families can afford a safe and reliable water supply.

Madam Speaker, we cannot allow this opportunity to slip through our fingers. Now is the time for transformative investments in our transportation systems and our infrastructure to improve our roads, bridges, railways, and transit systems to support American workers, to address equity and environmental justice, and to fight boldly against the climate crisis.

That is why I proudly support the INVEST in America Act.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I also want to say it is nice to see him on the floor in good and improving health.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us today makes in order 149 amendments to H.R. 3684, House Democrats' progressive infrastructure wish list that prioritizes Green New Deal mandates above actual transportation needs.

Sadly, only 18 percent of the amendments made in order under this rule were offered by Republicans. Compare that with the FAST Act. The FAST Act was the last surface transportation reauthorization bill, which was signed into law back in 2015.

Back then, Republicans controlled the House. Yet, 30 percent of the amendments made in order were amendments offered by Democrats. The bill itself was actually bipartisan, unlike the bill we are debating today. And even with that bipartisan bill, Republicans, when we were in charge, allowed 30 percent of the amendments to come from Democrats. That is nearly double the amount that Democrats are allowing Republicans to offer today.

Democrats went so far that they stripped out a Republican amendment that was actually agreed to in the Transportation Committee's markup. It was agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. GIMENEZ from Florida offered an amendment during the committee consideration of this bill, H.R. 3684. Mr. GIMENEZ offered an amendment that would prohibit civil penalties in the bill from being used to publicly finance political campaigns.

For example, under this amendment, civil penalties for violating rules on transporting animals could not have been used to contribute to a politician's campaign coffers. It is actually unfathomable that the majority accepted that Republican amendment, an amendment that is good for transparency and good for taxpayers, only to then strip it out in the Rules Committee print.

Madam Speaker, compromise used to be when Republicans and Democrats came together to pass a bill that is actually bipartisan. That is compromise. Today, though, compromise is being defined as liberals and socialists coming together to pass a partisan piece of legislation.

During his inauguration, I sat there and listened to Joe Biden say: "With unity, we can do great things." I don't know if the House Democrats missed that memo or if they weren't listening like I was at the inauguration. Or maybe Joe Biden was saying that unity is when liberal activist groups come together.

With today's rule, liberals are doubling down on the partisan approach to government, and it is not just me saying this. According to the majority's own press release, this bill moves further left than finding compromise.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I look forward to continuing this dialogue respectfully.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MORELLE), a very distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MORELLE. Madam Speaker, I thank my dear friend and fellow member of the Rules Committee, Mr.

DESAULNIER, for giving me the opportunity to speak for just a moment.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule that would allow us to consider the INVEST in America Act.

This long-overdue infrastructure legislation will prioritize direct Federal investments in roads, bridges, transit, and rail, while also leveraging modern and innovative approaches to reliable and sustainable infrastructure investments.

As we continue our recovery from the pandemic and seek to revitalize our communities, we know an essential part of that is strengthening our local infrastructure. Modernizing our infrastructure helps to meet growing mobility demands, create jobs, and grow the economy, all while creating stronger and more interconnected communities.

I am thrilled that this legislative package lays the groundwork for major investments across the country while also supporting opportunities to strengthen our local infrastructure through targeted priorities.

My own community of Rochester, New York, will only grow stronger through the enactment of the INVEST in America Act, and I look forward to seeing this critical legislation passed into law.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have helped move this transformative bill forward, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of the rule and the underlying bill. And I call on our partners in the Senate to join us in making this investment a reality.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman DEFAZIO for his tireless work on this effort, and my dear friend, Mr. DESAULNIER, for yielding time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, my good friend from New York talked about investment, but I would like to remind my liberal colleagues that this bill ties \$1 out of every \$2 into Green New Deal mandates. And the infrastructure that is being talked about in some parts of this bill is actually defined as art.

So let's just keep the facts in perspective and remember that these words actually do have meaning.

Madam Speaker, included in today's rule is a provision that prevents consideration of joint resolutions terminating COVID-19 mandates.

Right now, America is the most COVID-resilient country in the world. We are the most resilient in the world, thanks to President Trump and Operation Warp Speed. It is time for us to return to normal because President Trump, by putting science over political science, gave us the ability to return to normal.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) to discuss his resolution that would terminate the COVID-19 emergency mandates.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule.

While I do not support the legislation this rule brings up, that is not the main reason for my objection. I am opposed to the rule before us because provision 6 in the rule turns off section 202 of the National Emergencies Act relating to the COVID-19 national emergency for the remainder of the 117th Congress.

What this line really does is kill a joint resolution I introduced 2 weeks ago in accordance with the National Emergencies Act. The framers of this act wrote the law to inject congressional oversight to rein in the emergency powers codified into U.S. law that give the President additional powers in times of declared emergency.

Section 202 outlined the process where, 6 months after an emergency is declared, Congress meets to consider a joint resolution of termination, forcing the debate on the necessity of continuing the national emergency and correlating powers given to the President.

Over a year later, Congress has never met to debate the merit of the COVID-19 declared emergency, even after the President extended the emergency another year. This is because Congress has a poor track record in enforcing our emergency duties.

In fact, there are over 30 active emergencies on the books dating back to the Carter administration—hardly emergencies, I take it—few of which this body has ever met to debate the merit of the emergency and the powers it invokes.

With nationwide cases falling, vaccine rates rising, mask mandates being lifted, and States reopening with no capacity limits, it would seem appropriate to debate whether or not this Nation is truly in a state of emergency, not to mention, once again, the mandated duties of oversight of the executive branch.

Therefore, I introduced H.J. Res. 52 to have this debate. I did this because the first joint resolution I introduced was killed in a prior rule.

□ 1300

Now the majority is killing debate on the COVID emergency for the entire 117th Congress unless the majority leadership determines we can have this debate. I guess that is not part of the law.

This completely goes against the explicit expedited procedure in the law providing for quick and efficient oversight. This is tyranny of the majority at its finest.

Why must we continue to neglect our duties?

Why must we continue the congressional track record of being asleep at the wheel and yielding more power to the executive?

The National Emergencies Act mandates that we have this debate, and that is all my joint resolution does—require the people's Representatives to

meet, debate, and vote on a termination resolution of the COVID emergency powers in accordance with the law.

Madam Speaker, you may feel that we are still in an emergency. You may still feel COVID is a threat but not a national emergency, or you may feel the national emergency is over. However you feel, I am simply asking that we engage in the debate as the law requires.

Using the National Emergencies Act, the executive has requested powers outside the scope of Article II. As this declared emergency continues, the executive could request even more. This body should debate on whether to rein in the extraordinary powers, especially among the backdrop of a radically different COVID situation in this Nation.

In a time when this body is trying to reassert its claim on Article I authorization, simple oversight like this restores trust. Trust is a series of promises kept with the citizens of this great Nation. Imagine that, trust, just by following the definitions and the law.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania on his kind observation about my own personal health.

Just in regards to this debate, as somebody who went into the ICU on the first date in the State of California that the Governor of California actually required shelter in place, and I was then put on a ventilator for 4 weeks at the same time that the country was dealing with this pandemic, maybe I have a little unique perspective.

So evidence-based research maybe is in the mind of the beholder. I trust my doctors. I know they are human, and I know evidence-based research is the reason I stand here in front of you, Madam Speaker, by following the doctors.

I think of what the Speaker is doing and what the President is doing, and that is following evidence-based research and statistically protecting Americans. We know if Americans get vaccinated, we know if we are sensitive to distances around us and masking, we still have challenges. And for somebody like myself, who has an underlying health condition, I am particularly sensitive to this. Not everybody is in the same position vis-a-vis their medical risks.

So with all due respect, the debate is always a good one, but from my perspective I wish that people would keep in mind that this pandemic is not done until the evidence-based research indicates that it is done. I know everybody wants to get back to normal. I know I do too, as well, but I would like to be able to enjoy this wonderful existence that we all are allowed to do as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I share the bipartisan happiness at seeing his smiling face and good health back.

I rise in support of the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 3684, the INVEST in America Act.

We need to invest in the infrastructure of the future, not the past. This surface transportation reauthorization legislation, along with the important package of water infrastructure and assistance outlined in this bill will make a meaningful and bold difference in the lives of Americans.

I am proud to have authored a number of provisions in this bill, but at the moment I want to specifically address the water package that is in the bill, thanks to the tireless work of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Water is a human right that no one should be denied. In this pandemic, the very first instructions before we ever wore masks, we told people to wash your hands. Yet, so many Americans didn't have access to water because the water had been turned off. Imagine living in this pandemic and not having sanitary conditions—water in a running bathroom.

This bill includes legislation that I have authored with Representatives TLAIB and BLUNT ROCHESTER, the Water Debt Relief Act, that establishes a \$4 billion residential emergency relief program through EPA for public water systems to forgive any debt incurred by struggling households since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic. Many are in our frontline communities. It would also prevent water systems from cutting off any of these households from clean water. People have a right to be able to wash their hands.

Additionally, it includes bipartisan legislation that I have co-led with Representatives BLUNT ROCHESTER, KATKO, and TLAIB that would establish a permanent, long-term water assistance program to address the growing water debt crisis we have.

I thank the leadership of Chairman DEFAZIO and Chairman PALLONE, and I urge my colleagues to support this.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, water is certainly infrastructure. What is not is art. While the majority places restrictions on building roads—again, roads actually are infrastructure. While there are restrictions on roads, there is no restriction on using Federal transit money for art. Essentially, this bill defines art as infrastructure.

Let's talk more about roads which are, as I define, actually infrastructure.

The so-called infrastructure bill actually bans construction of new roads. The bill also prioritizes urban areas at the expense of rural and suburban communities. There are massive increases in transit and rail funding, yet, again, there are restrictions on the building

of roads—the transportation mode rural Americans use the most.

Madam Speaker, since his first day in office, President Biden has declared a war on blue-collar workers. He has also declared a war on the American energy industry. Thanks to liberal Democrats and the fantasy of the Green New Deal, energy costs for Americans are skyrocketing. It is evident at the gas pump where prices heading into the Fourth of July weekend are the highest they have been since 2014.

Now, Republicans and conservatives believe that America should be energy independent. That is good for American families, it is good for the economy, and it is certainly good for national security.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Congressman JEFF DUNCAN's Protecting American Energy Production Act.

This legislation, which I am a proud cosponsor of, would prohibit the President from declaring a moratorium on fracking without congressional approval.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment into the RECORD, along with any extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), who is here to explain this amendment and is the bill's author and my good friend.

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question, so that we can amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 751, the Protecting American Energy Production Act.

Now, my bill is straightforward. It prohibits the President from declaring a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, unless Congress authorizes the moratorium.

It further expresses the sense of Congress that States should maintain authority for the regulation of oil and natural gas production on State and private lands. That is how it has been done for decades.

President Biden and House Democrats have wasted no time in this Congress, and since his administration began, undermining American energy independence. They have signaled that they will use any tool necessary to end fossil fuel production in the United States.

In fact, Democrats keep rushing to President Biden's defense, claiming he never supported a fracking ban, which is simply not true. When he was asked by a debate moderator during the Presidential debates in 2019 if there was any

place for fossil fuels in his administration, this is what Senator Biden, now-President Biden, actually said: "No. We would work it out. We would make sure it's eliminated."

He was talking about fossil fuels.

How is this policy working out for the American people at the pump?

They are seeing higher prices for gasoline, and as they are getting ready to travel over the holidays and go on vacation, they are paying more at the pump. That is less money to spend on their family for family vacation during the holiday this summer. That is what bad policy gets you, Madam Speaker.

President Biden has already made good on his promises to revoke the Keystone XL permit, ultimately resulting in its cancellation and the loss of thousands of American and Canadian jobs—thousands of jobs. He also has halted all new Federal oil and gas leases. There is no telling which energy-killing promise he will fulfill next as he continues his war against American energy.

Instead of prioritizing American jobs and American energy, President Biden and the Democrats would rather appease the backwards logic of the radical environmental left. I have no other way to say it.

They would rather make us weaker and more reliant on energy from our foreign adversaries at a time when we are energy independent and we are actually exporting oil and gas.

The adversaries that they are supporting have no regard for the environmental standards that we all push in this country.

The INVEST in America Act—or more accurately titled, the green new deal and inflation transportation act—is a continuation of this America-last agenda. One out of every \$2 spent in this bill is tied up in Green New Deal priorities. Madam Speaker, one out of every \$2 is tied up in Green New Deal priorities.

It is ironic that while President Biden has no problem killing American energy projects and jobs, he is greenlighting at the same time Russian energy projects, like the Nord Stream II Pipeline that is going to bring gas into Europe and give Vladimir Putin even more control to manipulate politics in Europe.

President Biden doesn't think twice before waiving sanctions on a Russian company and friend of Vladimir Putin's.

Undercutting American energy production is a handout to Vladimir Putin and opens doors for Russia to influence operations across Europe and even in the United States.

New England doesn't have a pipeline for natural gas to come up there. They bring an LNG ship in from Russia that provides natural gas to the New England States—Russian, not American gas.

Colonial Pipeline's cyberattack is the most recent reminder of this longstanding effort by the Russians. Putin

will continue to use energy as a political weapon, and through policies like the partisan Green New Deal infrastructure package, Democrats will continue to help Russia, not American families—they are paying more at the pump this summer—Russia, Vladimir Putin. Putin will continue to use those policies.

The infrastructure policies we should be focused on are hardening our energy infrastructure to protect against these attacks, but the INVEST in America Act doesn't do this.

It instead remakes the entire energy market, squeezes fossil fuels, and makes the grid far more vulnerable to attacks.

The INVEST in America Act puts radical climate and Green New Deal priorities above the infrastructure needs of the Nation.

It creates more roadblocks for transporting clean-burning LNG, gives more money to EV charging stations than to the entire Rebuild Rural America grant program, and it fails to include any regulatory reforms that plague infrastructure projects.

My goodness, instead of voting on a \$548 billion Green New Deal-disguised infrastructure bill, we should be protecting American energy production and American energy jobs here in the United States.

Not long ago, the U.S. depended on OPEC for much of our oil supply. We now lead the world in oil and gas production as well as emission reduction. That is a fact that the left doesn't want to acknowledge. We lead the world in emissions reduction.

The Democrats refuse to acknowledge this and recognize this. Instead, they want to surrender one of our greatest economic and strategic advantages: our energy independence. As Admiral Mike Mullen once said: "There is no national security without energy security."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RESCENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina such additional time as he may consume.

Mr. DUNCAN. Listen to this, Madam Speaker, there is no national security without energy security.

How true is that statement?

This is all in the name of saving the climate. The reality is phasing out fossil fuels in the United States won't eliminate carbon emissions globally. Production will just happen someplace else, oftentimes in dirty production areas, because they don't have the same regulations that we have so that the environment gets dirtier, along with the jobs and geopolitical leverage that we have when we export our energy.

Democrats' anti-fossil fuel agenda will have no effect on the climate. Eliminating fossil fuels will also undercut our own economic interests. On average, a Federal fracking ban will increase household energy costs by \$618 a year.

Allowing President Biden to ban fracking will make all of this worse. Russia, China, and Iran stand ready to take advantage of us as we continue to pursue this self-inflicting harm.

By prohibiting the President from banning fracking, we, in turn, safeguard our energy production, our national security, our geopolitical influence, and the livelihoods of Americans—thousands of Americans—who have lost their job.

At the end of the day, American citizens—our constituents—pay less at the pump and for their household energy needs when we produce energy here in this country. That is a winning solution, and this bill that we are hoping to replace isn't.

So if President Biden wants to back up his buy America rhetoric, I have a question for him:

Why not start right here?

Let's buy American energy.

If he truly believes in buy America, then let's buy American energy and support American energy jobs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that the House will immediately consider this bill, put Americans back to work, and protect our national energy security.

□ 1315

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just briefly on the points that were just brought up. As somebody who represents a county that has four refineries in it, those four refineries produce much of the refined CARB-certified fuel on the West Coast and in California. Also, a county that is headquarters to the second largest energy company in the United States, Chevron, this isn't about ending the fossil fuel industry.

It is about the transition from that energy source to a new, cleaner, renewable, alternative fuel energy source. It is about being independent and being mindful about what our global competitors are doing; what the Chinese are doing to get ahead of us in this energy source.

So with all due respect, as someone who knows the benefit and also the dangers and the opportunities to the fossil fuel industry, as we have experienced it in this country, those four refineries only employ people, as required by State statute, who have graduated from State-approved apprenticeship programs, the best apprenticeship programs in the world. Each one of those jobs have a multiplier of 14. We like those jobs. We want to keep those jobs.

But we want to meet the reductions we have to have to be leaders in this country on climate reductions, and prepare for a future that isn't dependent on the fossil fuel industry; both for our public health, and our environment, and for our economy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

I came to Congress 25 years ago determined that the Federal Government should be a better partner, working with our communities, making our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

I have traveled to over 200 communities, working with architects, landscape, engineers, local government, State government, transit, listening to their concerns about how we make the transportation system work better.

I can say unequivocally that this legislation that we are considering today reflects what America wants. There is a broad consensus that we can't keep doing the same thing.

We need to make sure that we build a low-carbon future; that it is equitable; that deals with the challenges that indiscriminate infrastructure inflicted on communities. I have an example in my hometown, where a transportation project, a freeway, just ripped through an African-American community, without the sense of what it was doing to people who weren't involved.

Well, people don't want to do that anymore, and they want to have a multi-modal solution.

The nonsense that we hear from the other side, that somehow this will prohibit construction of new roads, is not true. But what it does is emphasize fixing it first and having plans that put the pieces together in a way that solves problems rather than creating new ones.

Yes, we ought to pursue the bipartisan agreement that the President has struck with our friends in the Senate. I think that is optimistic. But we need to reauthorize the Surface Transportation Act. And with the approach that has been offered by the administration and embodied in this legislation, we are cutting to the chase.

The details here matter. \$45 billion would be authorized to deal with the lead pipes that are poisoning our children; streamlining drinking water standards. Yes, it deals with roads and bridges. It has transformational investments for transit, \$109 billion, and attention to rural and urban areas. Passenger and freight rail, and triples funding for Amtrak.

It is beyond just the numbers. It is how we put these pieces together.

Madam Speaker, I cringe a little bit when I have my friends dismiss the notions of a low-carbon future. I bring you greetings from Portland, Oregon, where we had three record-breaking 116-degree temperatures in June. The Pacific Northwest is facing a climate catastrophe that, in no small measure, is due to the fact that we are not doing what we all could to have a low-carbon future.

This legislation captures the moment. It invests in the future, not in the past. It is how we will heal divisions, protect the planet, revitalize the economy, and pull America together.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Oregon said that he ran for Congress to make everyday Americans more financially secure. If that is the case, this bill is not going to do any of that, and here is why. There is a little thing called inflation, which is a tax from an economic perspective.

This bill's massive price tag, which is just under \$550 billion, that price tag relies heavily on deficit spending, which further fuels inflation and increases the costs of goods, like food and gas, that everyday Americans need. That is the true cost—just one of the true costs of this bill, which will hurt blue-collar workers.

Now, if you are a member of the Zoom class, if you are a woke yuppie that is staring at screens all day, not actually working for a living, well, you can take your \$100,000-plus income and buy an electric vehicle.

But let's talk about electric vehicles. Although the gentleman from Oregon thinks they are the wave of the future, this bill provides \$4 billion for electric vehicle charging stations, but only \$1 billion for the Rebuild Rural grant program that helps people who are likely living in rural areas, making less than \$100,000.

And why I am focused on \$100,000 is because 70 percent of electric car owners earn at least \$100,000 a year. Again, the electric vehicles are not going to do anything really for the environment, but it sounds good if you are a woke yuppie sitting at home.

Further, this empowers China, which China is the world's greatest polluter. If you take all the emissions of the United States, all of the EU, and Japan, added together, we still collectively don't emit more than China does. And we rely on China for 80 percent of our critical minerals that we need to actually make an electronic vehicle.

So, again, scoring cheap political points, hurting blue-collar workers, and doing zero to actually improve the environment.

But talking about radical policies: Radical progressives, including Members of this very body, have called for a Federal ban on fracking. Again, more of the war on blue-collar workers.

So, apparently, Democrats and liberal Progressives don't care about American workers. These blue-collar workers, these guys that are working the oil and gas pads of southwestern Pennsylvania, they rely on fracking for jobs. In fact, a fracking ban would cost 7.5 million jobs by 2022.

They must not care. Democrats must not care about American families either because household energy costs would increase over \$600 per year, while household incomes would fall by \$5,400 a year annually.

My good friend, my fellow Member from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRED KELLER, knows just how devastating a

fracking ban would be to our State and national economy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) to explain this.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and co-Pennsylvanian for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 751, the Protecting American Energy Production Act, which would prevent the Biden administration from unilaterally imposing a moratorium on hydraulic fracturing.

Pennsylvania is home to some of the most abundant energy and natural gas resources in the Nation, and our economy is proof of all the benefits that come with it. On any given day, up to 10 percent of the Nation's dry natural gas comes out of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District.

Energy producers have been critical partners in central and northeastern Pennsylvania, investing in local communities, colleges, generating countless job opportunities, and preparing the next generation of workers for in-demand careers.

However, President Biden has made it clear that he is no friend of American energy or the workers employed by this industry. He has canceled the Keystone XL pipeline, rejoined the disastrous Paris climate accords, and banned all new oil and gas leases on Federal lands.

Meanwhile, the President lifted sanctions on Russia's Nord Stream 2 pipeline, thereby prioritizing Russian energy over domestic American energy.

Overregulation, Federal mandates, and policies that will kill American energy production ignore facts and, instead, increase energy costs and weaken our national security.

These energy-killing policies are paving the way for the Green New Deal. Democrats like to sell this package as a greener America when, in reality, it makes our Nation more dependent on foreign nations for our growing energy needs; I might add, foreign nations that don't protect the environment and develop this energy as safely as we do here in the United States.

These energy needs, what we do in the United States, would sustain good-paying jobs, create prosperity for future generations, and secure American interests around the globe. We must invest in critical infrastructure like pipelines and refineries, and promote a regulatory environment that cultivates innovation in the energy sector.

We must reject policies that place higher premiums on appeasing the Democrats' Green New Deal ambitions than protecting the future of America's energy sector and the thousands of American workers it employs.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so that the House can immediately consider this important legislation.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A couple of points. I appreciate the attention to the Clean Corridors Program. Again, this is about preparing for the future, from my perspective. This bill prepares for the future, and it prepares American workers to transition to that future and future generations.

On the Clean Corridors Program, Chinese are already doing this. In December, they produced 100,000 new charging and alternative fuel stations to prepare for the future. The Chinese have over a million of these stations. The U.S. has less than 50,000.

So if we want to talk about energy independence, right on. That is what we want to talk about. We want to prepare America for the future, while we protect the planet.

The State of California gets more venture capital for research and renewables and alternative fuels than the other 49 States combined.

Why is that?

Because we are preparing for the future. We want to be competitive, and we want our workforce to continue to be the best in the world when it comes to energy. And we want to compete against the Chinese so that we are ready to capture these new energy sources. And we are doing it.

It is not only good for the environment, it is good for the economy.

And I would say, as a Californian who has been in the middle of this—and I will agree to being a liberal. I was once described as a liberal Republican under former party affiliations. I don't think there is any such thing anymore, probably.

This is about preparing for the future. And mostly it is about preparing our American workforce to continue to be what they have been for so long, the best workforce, the best workers in the world. But you give them the tools to do that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIRE), my good friend.

Mr. SIRE. Madam Speaker, it is nice to see our colleague back, ready for the fight. It is nice to have him back.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak in favor of the INVEST in America Act today. This type of investment in our country's surface transportation is long overdue.

The American Society of Civil Engineers has rated our infrastructure a C-minus and said that we will need additional \$2.6 trillion over the next decade to make the needed upgrades and repairs.

In New Jersey, drivers lose an average of \$713 per year from driving on our roads, and 7.8 percent of our bridges are structurally deficient.

The INVEST in America Act will deliver \$343 billion for roads, bridges, and safety; \$109 billion for transit; and \$95 billion for freight and passenger rail.

Beyond improving our surface transportation networks, this bill will make crucial investments to reduce carbon

pollution and increase climate resiliency.

I also want to thank Chairman DEFAZIO and Ranking Member GRAVES for including funding for Member Designated Projects in the INVEST in America Act, which will deliver necessary resources to communities in a transparent and accountable fashion.

My district will receive critical funding for projects to connect pedestrians with transit, improve roadway safety, construct a ferry terminal, and improve drainage systems and traffic signals.

This bill is a win for New Jersey and a win for our country. We have costly needs, and the INVEST in America Act meets them.

□ 1330

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from California, who I do consider a friend, was talking about electric vehicles. I think there is a disconnect with where that electricity comes from.

The drywall is not producing electricity when you plug in an electric vehicle. The electricity is being manufactured in a plant. So even if you had 100 percent electric vehicles, the source of the electricity is still coming from some kind of fossil fuel. That is the reality. It might upset some folks, but that is just the reality of electric vehicles.

Even if we were to go to a 100 percent renewable clean energy for all of our energy needs, even if we were to cede that part of the argument, you still need petrochemicals. You still need oil and gas for petrochemicals that we use for everything.

If you are one of the individuals who is lucky enough to earn over \$100,000 a year and can afford a Tesla, I want you to look at the dashboard on your Tesla and thank an American fracker because I can guarantee you that dashboard is not made with hemp. It is made of petrochemicals.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Madam Speaker, I thank my fellow Californian for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the INVEST in America Act, a \$547 billion infrastructure bill that will invest in communities across the country.

This bold piece of legislation includes \$20 million in contract authority to fund the I-15 northern extension project in my own community in Riverside County.

This investment will create jobs in the Inland Empire; it will meet our basic infrastructure needs; and it will improve our freeways and better connect our region.

The INVEST in America Act will put us on the path to finally modernizing



our Nation's roads, bridges, rails, and water systems, while keeping in mind the urgency to fight climate change.

I do not hear from my colleagues across the aisle language that speaks to the future; I hear language instead that clings to the past. On this side of the aisle, we speak about a transition to a cleaner, more green future.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and invest in our communities.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, once again, Democrats are bringing a hyperpartisan bill to the floor. They are blocking Republican efforts to actually improve measures for the Americans who don't make \$100,000 a year, who can't afford a Tesla.

This is not me saying that. You can look at the numbers. You can follow the money.

Let's just look at the numbers. In 2015, when House Republicans were in charge and had another package that was an infrastructure package, 30 percent of the amendments were Democrat amendments. This time, only 18 percent of the amendments are Republican amendments. Clearly, this is far from a bipartisan bill.

Follow the money. It is no surprise that, under this bill, congressional districts in blue States would get almost double the funding for transportation projects compared to districts in red States.

Madam Speaker, while liberals and progressives push the Green New Deal fantasy on Americans, and while we do things like define art as infrastructure, House Republicans will continue to fight for investment in roads, bridges, and real transportation that will help real Americans and drive our economy.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and vote "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania. I do appreciate his comments about my personal health and also his collegiality.

His comments about being bipartisan, I completely agree with. But compromise requires, from my perspective—and granted, we do have a different perspective about how we get there and who is giving and how much is given.

I really think this bill is an incredibly important bill for the future of America and American workers and innovation.

As far as changing to renewables and alternatives, that electrical system has to be upgraded. We have seen what has happened because of climate change in the Gulf. We see the struggles we have on the West Coast with fires, all because, as evidence-based research tells us, what we have done with the environment and the benefits we have got-

ten from fossil fuels over the course of the last decades and century.

But now is the time to change and prepare for that change—not mindlessly. This isn't a radical proposal. This is about preparing for the future.

In terms of the infrastructure that gets those new alternative fuels, hydrogen fuel cell cars, battery electric cars, in California, we have acknowledged that we need to get these cars to be available to everyone, including people from disadvantaged communities. That is why we have changed the tax code to make it easier for everyone to get an alternative fuel car, not just wealthy people, and get the benefits of that.

I want to read a quote from *Forbes* magazine about infrastructure and electric cars: "These vehicles use a different kind of fuel and plug into our electricity system, and the good news about that is there are a number of cost-benefit studies," numerous ones, "that are showing this can be really beneficial to all ratepayers, not just the drivers of the vehicles."

The critical mass of changing helps everybody. It brings down the cost of energy. So, for those rising costs at the pump, there is a bend in the arc that will help everyone, as opposed to the opinions by my colleague and some of his other speakers today.

Matt Stanberry, the managing director for the advanced transportation program at the trade group Advanced Energy Economy, says: "As you increase electricity sales for charging the vehicles, it has the effect of driving down rates for all ratepayers because it spreads the fixed cost of the system out across a larger volume of sales."

Madam Speaker, this is about preparing for this new energy future. Whoever gets there first, as a country, as always in our history, has a predominant role in foreign affairs and the leadership on this globe. The Chinese are trying to beat us to that. We can't let that happen. We talk about global competitiveness. We need to get the infrastructure in. Yes, they need to do a better job at reducing pollution, traditional pollutants and carbon.

The Clean Air Act, originally signed by Richard Nixon, and then changed and amended by Ronald Reagan, two Republicans, and the waiver that, unfortunately, previous administrations gave to California through multiple generations, have fueled, pardon the expression, the benefits we have gotten in public health and traditional pollutants. It is fueling today the States that join California, like Colorado, which are pushing this innovation.

Madam Speaker, this is about the future of America and America's excellence and its energy independence and its workforce, staying at home and providing for this energy independence for future generations.

Madam Speaker, in a moment, I will offer an amendment to the rule to make in order the amendment offered by Ms. SLOTKIN, which amends the un-

derlying bill to prohibit using transit funds for artwork and nonfunctional landscaping.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESAULNIER

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or House Resolution 504, the amendment specified in section 7 shall be in order as though printed as the last amendment in House Report 117-75 is offered by Representative Slotkin or a designee. That amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

SEC. 7. The amendment referred to in section 6 is as follows:

Page 722, strike lines 1 through 5 (and redesignate accordingly).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 751) to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 751.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution and the amendment thereto.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

□ 1345

ESTABLISHING THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 504, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 503) establishing the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol, and ask for its immediate consideration.